

JEWISH TRACTS No. 3

# Jew and Non-Jew

By MARTIN A. MEYER, Ph.D.

Late Rabbi of Temple Emanu El  
San Francisco, Cal.

THIS is one of a series of tracts published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. These tracts are prepared by the Tract Commission appointed jointly by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. They are designed to convey information on the Jewish religion and Jewish history, and intended for general distribution.

## The Tract Commission

UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS  
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS  
MERCHANTS BUILDING  
CINCINNATI

---

# JEW AND NON-JEW

---

::     ::     MARTIN A. MEYER, PH.D.     ::     ::

---

THE attitude of the Jew to the non-Jew during the thirty-five centuries of Jewish history has been subject to all the variations that time and circumstance could condition. A careful and detailed exposition of these changes would entail the production of a bulky volume. It shall be our endeavor briefly to outline the important phases of this great evolution, and to present the goal of the development, as well as to test its application at various points.

Apologetics are apt to overstate; polemics to under-rate. So on the one hand, the Jew writing in defense of his people has erred in presenting a picture so perfect even to the last detail as to create suspicion by its overperfection. On the other hand, the non-Jew has been guilty of gross misstatement and ignorant assertion. Most of these have copied the errors of their predecessors, one after the other, so that, though the scientific atmosphere is present in the form of numerous citations, its spirit has been sadly wanting by reason of manifest bias.

The starting point of all true Jewish thinking has been the integrity of the Jew and of Judaism. Everything else has been subordinated to that one concept. The right of every proper group to maintain its

identity and to perpetuate itself has been assumed as axiomatic. To conserve the people which Moses carried in his bosom as a father his child, the people which God took from the midst of another people, the nation upon whom God's name was called that it might be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, for whose protection the inspired seers of Israel dreamed and worked, rabbis thought and taught and a myriad witnesses died, this thought remains one of the foundation stones of all real Jewish thinking. It is indeed the touchstone by which all Jewish activity must be tested. The Jews looked upon themselves as the chosen people of God. Tradition has it that God offered the Torah first to the nations, each of which in turn rejected it. Israel alone was willing to submit to the duty of promulgating it. As is evidenced by the testimony of the prophets this did not entail the position that the other nations were rejected by Him. But whereas all nations were his children, Israel was his "first born," his chosen, with all the privileges of the first born, but also with all the responsibilities of that position. This gives the keynote of the situation. The attitude of the Jew has been more pro-Jewish than anti-alien; not indeed that he loved the alien less, but the Jew more.

The ancient world, as is well known, was not sympathetic to the stranger. The attitude, for example, of the Greek to the barbarian is familiar. It was largely

one of unqualified contempt. The best of her philosophers shared in this point of view to a more or less extent. The very word "barbarian" had a sinister implication. Citizenship being a political and a religious fact, and religion being founded upon the performance of a common ancestral cult, the outsider remained an outsider with all the disadvantages of the alien. Yet it is interesting to note that Zeus was considered the special guardian of the stranger. Judaism had no such physical basis for its religious life, and consequently stood ready to accept the stranger into the fold far earlier and far more readily than did the Greek world.

It has become a part of the outfit of every high school boy that the Latin confounded in language and in thought the stranger and the enemy. It may be that the Jew began his history with the same confusion, but there is no evidence in the language preserved to us in the Old Testament scriptures. The early records point to a narrow conception of his relations with the nations, but, with startling rapidity, he developed the fullest implications of his religious attitude and laid aside his antagonism to the stranger in favor of a broad and inclusive sense of fraternity. In his struggle with surrounding polytheism, it was no easy matter to preserve the balance between his zeal for his faith and his feeling against paganism and the fraternal ideal of his religious life. Frequently

identifying the enemies of God with the enemies of Israel, he had no small task in clearly asserting his view point of human brotherhood. Yet his earliest codes preserve passages which are proof that he even then entertained sentiments, generous towards the non-Jew. The inclusion of the stranger in the Sabbath law in the Decalog, the prohibition not to hate the Egyptian despite what Israel had suffered at the hands of Egypt, the command to love the stranger because "ye know the heart of the stranger," the rule of equality before the law for stranger and native born, Solomon's prayer for the stranger, Ahab hailing the defeated king of Syria as his brother, Isaiah's "my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples," as well as the missionary zeal of the prophets—all these facts offer a line of testimony in support of the Jewish tradition of generosity towards the non-Jew through a long and troublous period of historical development.

The treatment of the conquered Canaanites was in accord with the laws of ancient warfare. Yet even in this field we find attempts in the Book of Deuteronomy to modify the severities of such usages. It must be polemics hard put to finding standing place which falls back upon war measures as an indictment of the attitude which the Jew held to the outsider. Similarly it is weak to place overmuch emphasis upon the expressions of an exasperated people in

times of great national distress and to draw general conclusions therefrom. The Jew never set up the impossible ideal of loving his enemies, though he counselled moderation and restraint in the treatment of them. Human-like he vented his wrath and his contempt upon his merciless conquerors in bitter words when no other weapon was left him. In his early national life, while he was able successfully to maintain himself against the world, his point of view was less sympathetic, though his teachers laid recurrent emphasis upon his religious duty in this respect.

When the larger contacts of history were made, when he was threatened in turn by Assyrian, Egyptian and Babylonian, the Jew took an increasingly larger point of view. When the great catastrophe of the first exile overtook him, adversity taught him a still broader sympathy. As nationality counted less and less, religion counted more and more. Jeremiah could counsel loyal citizenship on the part of the conquered in place of stirring up further hatred and mistrust. The Second Isaiah, tutored in the bitter school of adversity in a foreign land, could rise to the heights, and vision the gathering of the peoples in Zion under the aegis of the Lord of Hosts. The world of the prophets had no narrow horizon. It was coterminous with ancient civilization. And the Jew learned from the stranger as the stranger learned from him. If



Persian and Babylonian influences played any role in Jewish thought—and who doubts that they did?—it was because the Jew was ready to admit such influences. The sympathetic overlordship of Persia left deep traces upon the soul and mind of the Jew, which had not been possible if the Jew had at that time set himself up in opposition to all things non-Jewish. It was no rabid pro-Judaean who hailed the heathen Cyrus as the Messiah. It was no tribalist who saw in God's dealings with the nations, the working out of a Divine plan for humankind. True, Israel was the center of that plan; but in the plan the nations played their appointed role. The Greek felt too self-sufficient to admit that the barbarian world had anything to teach him. No doubt the assertions of the later Jews of Alexandria that the philosophers had gone to school to the prophets and the priests of Jerusalem but added to the bitterness which the Greeks entertained towards Jewish propagandists in particular, though no less illiberal towards other "barbarians."

There is no evidence that even Ezra and Nehemiah, who are so frequently referred to as types of narrow-minded Judaism, entertained any sentiments hostile to non-Jewish peoples. Their objections to inter-marriage with heathen and half-heathen peoples were based upon far higher grounds. They realized that the integrity of the restored nation and church was at stake. A loose compromise policy which would have



continued to permit the Samaritans to further influence the ideals of nascent Judaism would have destroyed the Jew and eliminated his point of view at a time when it was phrasing itself and preparing for its largest service. We must let go frequently, the better to hold on. And these far seeing statesmen and religionists saw beyond the temporary circumstances of compromise and conciliation with those to whom conciliation was a onesided process.

When the Jew came into intimate contact with the larger world of the west, and was compelled to struggle to maintain himself and his point of view, he started out with well defined convictions upon the matter of his attitude to and his relations with the world outside. Whatever our theories of the date of the Pentateuch, the Persian period saw the Jew with his Torah, if not in final form at any rate substantially as it is today. The "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19:16) rang out all the more clearly and vividly because it was set in the very book in which one would least expect it. And the testimony of an unbroken line of Jewish teachers must be taken as conclusive as to the inclusive meaning of *neighbor* even against the anti-Jewish coterie of modern scholars whose delight it is to rob Israel of every vestige of power and truth.

The missionary vision of the Second Isaiah rests upon the conceptions of the divine and human unity

as found in the older Israelitish codes and literature. The Universal God, Lord God of the spirits of *all* flesh, looks down from heaven upon *all* the sons of man and demands that *all* his children shall dwell together in peace and in safety. And that missionary faith continued in Israel through the long years of Persian preparation, of Greek temptation and of Roman domination and persecution. It evoked the sneer from the lips of the evangelist that the Pharisees compassed land and sea to gain one proselyte. It continued despite the disaffection of incipient Christianity and the loss of all vestiges of national life, with the attendant horrors of the Roman wars and the scattering of the people among the nations. It outlived the official recognition of Christianity and its alliance with the State. Active Jewish propaganda succumbed only to force majeure. It has never died out of the hearts of true Israelites—the vision that some day the world would be “full of the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea.” It crystalized itself in the prayer book, that classic of Israel’s faith, and crowned each day’s prayer with the hope that “to Him every knee would bend and every tongue give homage.”

The two holy-days which the growing consciousness of the Jew singled out as most significant in his ecclesiastical year are not those founded upon events of his national history but upon universal human

need and experience. On the Day of Atonement<sup>1</sup> he selects for the prophetic lesson that gem of Bible books, Jonah, to inculcate the universal love and regard of God for all his creatures. On those solemn days the Jew prays "Now therefore O Lord our God impose Thine awe upon *all* Thy works and Thy fear upon *all* Thou hast created, that *all* Thy works may revere Thee and *all* Thy creatures prostrate themselves before Thee, that they may form a single band to do Thy will with a perfect heart," etc. And no people which so prays for *all* the world, which has the missionary spirit can be hostile to the world outside, however it may regard the calibre of the thought of the world. Its zeal may frequently be too ardent for measured statement and proper restraint. But desire for the recognition of Jewish truth and an active propaganda to that end could not rest upon any hostility to the stranger, implied or explicit; nor did it.

The Hellenistic period of Jewish history is rich in its evidences of the fraternal spirit and a splendid literature was produced under its inspiration. Over-eager propaganda was sometimes onesided; but the propagandist does not debate a question. He takes sides and asks adherence to that side. And above all else the Judæo-Hellenistic literature is zealous for the dissemination of Jewish truth among the peoples. In its advocacy of that truth many a literary forgery

may be charged to its misplaced ardor; yet thereby many a telling point was made—and no doubt with justice—against pagan morals and pagan theology in favor of Jewish viewpoints which hit hard and caused resentment. And the conscience of the age showed no disapproval of such pseudepigrapha. For the most part there is a well defined distinction in the literature of this period between the sin and the sinner, between the heathen scheme of life and the heathen himself.

Even Alexandrian anti-Semitism did not provoke a Jewish anti-Alienism. Philo wrote in the most exalted strain of the duty of the Jew to the outsider, and laid the basis of a fraternalism which now embraces the world. Josephus' "Contra Apionem" is a serious discussion of the anti-Judaic theses of the Egyptian; but there is nowhere any evidence of any feeling save that of righteous indignation at the monstrous charges rather than against the perpetrator of the charges. There is the expected emphasis upon the validity of the Jewish position; an anxiety to make his points good and strong; but no bitterness towards the outsider as such.

Many have taken the uncontrolled evidence of the New Testament as proof positive that the Judaism of the period was narrow, exclusive, tribal, unsympathetic—what not. It is forgotten that the New Testament is an *ex parte* statement made at a time when the desire to emphasize the differences between the

new church and the mother faith was dominant in the thinking of its authors; nor is the evidence of the Gospels and the Epistles uniform in the presentation of Jewish matters and points of view. When it is controlled by the unquestioned historical experiences of that period and the statements of the rabbinical literature, a far different picture is presented.

The frequent references in contemporary Latin and Greek literature to pagan converts to Judaism, the well known tales about Hillel and other rabbis at whose hands heathens sought admission into Judaism, the serious discussions of the rabbis about the method and the standards of admission for the proselyte to Judaism, the oft repeated tradition that sacrifices were offered on the feast of Tabernacles in the Temple at Jerusalem for the seventy nations (this number became stereotyped as representing the totality of non-Jewish peoples), the sacrifices offered on behalf of the foreign ruler (not to him), the fact of accommodations for the Gentile in the temple structure itself; the acceptance of gifts for the Temple from non-Jews (indeed the Torah itself contemplated the possibility of a Gentile offering sacrifice, Lev. 22:25), and tradition and history tell of as many such, indicate no "*odium generis humani*," hatred of the human race, such as the Roman Tacitus laid at the door of the Jew. The business and social relations which obtained between the Jew and the non-Jew at

this period (indeed the Assuan Papyri show how early and widespread such relations were) and of later Talmudic times are positive witnesses to the fact that the Jew rather than hating his fellowmen extended to him all the moral considerations which he felt were incumbent upon him towards his fellow-Jews.

In presenting the ideal of filial piety the rabbis of the Talmud cited the case of Dama ben Nethina, a non-Jew. Commenting upon the words of David (II Sam. 7:19) "This is the law for man, O Lord," the same teachers interpret it in a sense, to be sure not intended by the original speaker but indicative of their broadmindedness, "not a law for either priest or Levite or Jew but for *man*." We learn from the same sources that the Holy Sabbath itself might be violated in case of danger of life, of Gentiles as well as Jews. We also read that the poor, the sick, the dead and the mourner of the stranger are to be treated in just the same manner as the same classes of the house of Israel. Another well known passage lays down the rule that usury shall not be practiced even towards the non-Jew. The famous Hillel inculcates love of all fellow creatures, the word *Briyot* used being impossible of limited application to Jews alone; even Akiba, famous for his literal method of Bible interpretation, is cited in the Ethics of the Fathers as felicitating *mankind* because it was created



in the image of its Maker and of its consciousness of that fact. Ben Zoma, one of the leaders of his generation teaches "Despise not any man"; and so we might continue indefinitely citing rabbi after rabbi and his sentiments towards the non-Jew.

The horror of the Jew for idolatrous practices knew no limit and the utmost severity was manifested towards the Jew who had apostasized; but non-Jews were permitted the practice of their faith in Palestine provided they did nothing to offend the sensibilities of the public. The old formulas against idolaters and idolatry have been preserved since this period, but their theory and intent exclude Christian and Moslem. Despite the dietary laws we find that Jews and non-Jews dine together and social intercourse continued between Jews and their fellows until church councils stepped in and forbade such intercourse, often on pain of death. Mutual respect, one for the other, is apparent even through the acerbities of religious controversy, as witness Justin's *Dialog with the Jew Trypho*. The post Talmudical rabbis were frequently called upon to adjudicate cases involving the observance of the Sabbath and many similar things, arising out of business associations of Jews and non-Jews. Rather ought we consider the attitude of the dominant church on this subject as evidenced in the early centuries and the consequent effect upon the relations of their followers to Jews.



There were, too, leaders among the Jews at this time who represented a similar intransigent position towards the non-Jews; but the number of those who taught liberal opinions and lived them is all the more remarkable. Josephus who (*Contra Apionem* 2) teaches the duty of the Jew to respect the faith of his neighbor, finds himself in the company of the later rabbis who assert that the righteous of all peoples have a share in the bliss of the world to come. True the bitterness of spirit of a people whose rights and privileges were outraged by their Roman—both pagan and Christian—rulers found expression from time to time. The Zealots, true to their name, threw aside all restraints and expressed themselves in unmeasured terms as opposed to the oppressor; but these were not only sectarians of a religious nature but also extremists of a political party who desired war to the death with Rome. Many of their Jewish contemporaries viewed them with suspicion; their attitude can not be taken as typical of the Jew. When during these last wars with Rome one breaks out with the startling statement that “the best non-Jew is worthy of death” it is to be understood as provoked by the circumstances of the day fully as much as the statement forbidding association with non-Jews in the trying times of the Maccabean revolution (2 Mac. 14, 3:38). These expressions do not represent so much the normal standpoint of the

Jewish religion as they do the rebound of the persecuted against the persecutor in times of great stress. It would be just as fair, or unfair, to judge the attitude of German and French to each other, or of American and English by the heated bitter jingles and cartoons that are current during war times. Indeed, the Talmud itself suggests that responsibility is not to be urged too severely for expressions which are the result of woe or oppression. France, or even Victor Hugo himself, is not to be judged harshly because during the war, Hugo cries out, "Poison the wells, murder the sleeping; seize scythes, axes or pitchforks to kill them."

We find that Jesus refers to the non-Jews as dogs and swine. To those who know the excessive and exaggerated method of the oriental, such expressions occasion little surprise. But a *tu quoque* is not enough to urge in justification of the Jew's attitude. In a period such as that of the last wars with Rome (the Jewish war, 66-70; the Bar Kochba rebellion, 132-135) and in the Maccabean conflict with Syrian Hellenism, the question at stake is the very existence of Judaism itself. Extreme situations demand extreme measures. The real marvel is, the conflict past, that Judaism resumes its normal manner and goes on its way expanding and developing its own genius.

The persecutions of the Jews during the middle ages so relentlessly, so bitterly continued, evidenced

far more rancor on the part of the world towards the Jew than of the Jew to the world. It is significant to say the least that in southern France and Bohemia where Jewish influence was strong that the Albigense and Hussite movements developed. Jew must have met non-Jew in free intercourse; and while the Church visited both heretics and Jews with its fury, it is no little glory for the Jew thus to have helped the cause of religious development and freedom.

These mediaeval experiences have left an indelible impress upon the character of the Jew individually and socially. His doctrine of election tended to make him self-conscious and gave him a degree of self-assurance, which has protected him from extermination at many a critical period in his history. On the other hand, this long continued persecution has left him shy, sometimes suspicious. The constant menace of the proselytizer no less fearsome to him than the torture chamber itself has made him fear the Greeks when bearing gifts. He has become chary of making advances because he has found the world far more ready to accept his sacrifices than to yield one jot or tittle of its viewpoint; and because he has become so hypersensitive, every rebuff has sent him back decades and bewildered him. Probably at no time did he experience this more vividly than in the nineteenth century. Recognizing the dominant philosophy of cosmopolitanism as congenial to his Jewish view-

point, and having by his world experiences become a typical cosmopolite, he threw himself into the activities of modern times with a zest and a zeal that were admirable. He sacrificed much. Upon the vanity heap in the market place he cast many a cherished mode of life. Anti-Semitism sent him back and repulsed him in unmeasured terms assuring him that he did not belong to this western world and that his very presence was a menace to its well doing. We have learned bitter lessons; not that we would not associate with Gentiles, but we will not be patronized by our equals who consider themselves our betters; nor would we be thrust downwards merely for the sake of non-Jewish associations. This process has thrown the Jew back upon himself and has intensified his self-consciousness as well as certain racial characteristics and social differences.

But most remarkable is the fact that under the sting of this mistreatment his prayers for speedy release from his burning sorrows produced no expression of malice towards his tormentors. He has never attempted retaliatory measures—maybe he was too weak—maybe it was a mistake not to attempt to do so. But the fact remains that he has not. It is one of the ironies of history that at the very period that the Jew was giving greatest service to the world, acting as the economic intermediary between the nations, thus joining the east with the west, that the

world treated him worst. He has accepted his miserable lot with an heroic resignation unparalleled in history. His literature teems with expressions if not of love, yet of regard for and understanding of his persecutors. In the face of the worst, with cries of the dying still shrill in his ears, his rabbis have taught forbearance, restraint and even forgiveness. The bloody trail of the Crusaders across Europe is made luminous by the pathetic elegies of the Jew celebrating his martyred kin and by his marvelous forbearance and patience under the stinging blows of the crucifix—sword of the knights of the faith of love. The Spanish exiles depart from Spain with tear stained cheeks not only because of their physical pain but more because of their heart aches at leaving the fatherland which they loved despite the misery which its hard hearted kings and prelates had ground into their hearts. And the sons of these Spanish exiles still preserve the memory of their long residence in that land, and continue to speak the Castilian tongue of 1492.

Our religious philosophers write of Christianity and Islam in so liberal and appreciative a strain that their very words are worthy of quotation. In a day (12th century) in which Christendom had hardly emerged from the deep black of the dark ages, when heretics were hunted out like dogs, Jews spitted like swine, and Christian theology damned unbelievers to

eternal hell fire, the tolerant attitude of the Jewish philosophers is all the more remarkable. They continue the Jewish tradition which saw in all men brothers, descendants of the original man, and who believed that those who exercised the fundamental moralities of the seven Noachian Commands were worthy of Divine grace and blessing. Jehuda Ha-levi, the poet-philosopher of 12th century Spain in his dialog on the respective merits of the three faiths, called the *Kuzari*, writes "These religions (Christianity and Islam) are the preparation and the preface to the Messiah we expect, who is the fruit himself of the seed originally sown; and all men will be the fruit of God's seed when they acknowledge Him and all become one mighty tree." A half century later, Moses Maimonides expresses similar sentiments. Discussing the two great daughter religions of Judaism in his famous code "*The Strong Hand*," he writes: "The teachings of him of Nazareth (Jesus) and of the man of Ishmael (Mohammed) who rose after him, help to bring to perfection all mankind, so that they may serve God with one consent. For in that the world is full of the words of the Messiah, of the Holy Writ, and the Commandments—these words have spread to the ends of the earth even if many deny the binding character of them at the present day. And when the Messiah does come, all will return from their errors."



Maimonides' own father allowed himself the use of Moslem terminology and the Jewish moral philosopher, Bachya ibn Pakuda, praises the Christian institution of monasticism. Joseph Albo (15th century) shows the influence of Christian thought upon his philosophy, and Isaac Abarbanel, the exegete, quotes Christian authorities. A much earlier, even more interesting parallel to this is found in the case of Hai Gaon (10th century in Babylonia) who consulted the Catholicos of the oriental Christians at Bagdad with reference to the interpretation of difficult scriptural passages.

Many a precept comes from the Middle Age illustrative of Jewish care and treatment of the non-Jew. Lebi b. Isaac ha-Hasid, a French Jew of the 10th century, writes, "Treat with equal honesty the Christian as your brother in faith. If a Christian make a mistake to his loss, call his attention to it. If a Jew be a tax gatherer, demand no more from a Christian than from a Jew; A Jew shall not be untruthful in traffic with Jew or Gentile." Rabbi Jehudah b. Samuel of Regensburg writes in the Book of Pious Souls, "Mislead no one through thy actions designedly, be he Jew or non-Jew; be not disputatious and quarrelsome with people whatever be their faith \* \* \* If a contract be made between Jews and non-Jews, the former must fulfill it even if the latter fail to perform that to which they were bound. \* \* \* In-



justice must not be done whether one belongs to our religion or to another." Moses b. Coucy (1245) writes in his *Sefer Mitzvot Gedolot*, "Those who lie to non-Jews and steal from them belong to the category of blasphemers; for it is due to their guilt that many say the Jews have no binding law." With these and similar sentiments we invite comparison with the Middle Age Christian teaching that "one need not keep faith with a heretic." Asher b. Yechiel (1327) urges upon his sons in his *Ethical Testament*, "Remain grateful to any one who hath helped thee; be sincere and true with everyone, even though they be not Jews; be the first to extend courteous greeting to every man whatever be his faith and provoke not to wrath one whose belief differs from thine." The sentiments thus expressed were translated into practice and though the religion of the Jew was despised, he showed that his faith in humankind was greater than misunderstanding and insult. "By their works shall ye know them"; the works of the Jew speak for themselves.

It is said that in southern France in the 12th century Christians had to be restrained from bringing their cases before Jewish courts where it was claimed the administration of justice was more intelligent and fairer-minded. Jewish hospitality was famous for its generosity, though many a non-Jew thus entertained repaid his host's kindness not in kind but in pain.

Sick and penniless travelers were frequently cared for in Jewish institutions, where need was met and no questions asked. Jews taught non-Jews not only the lore of Shem but also instructed them in the secular sciences, chiefly medicine, mathematics and astronomy, in which they were particularly proficient. These literary friendships are noteworthy. The great Church Father and Bible student Origen begins the long line of such relations. St. Jerome (d. 420 C. E.) studied with a Jew as did the Prior of Fulda in the 8th century. History further preserves the names of a large number of Jews and their Christian pupils. The Abbot Nilus and the Jew Donnolo; Michael Scotus and the Jew Anatoli; Robert of Aragon and the Jews Kalonymos and Levi Romani; Reuchlin and the Jews Obadiah Sforno and Jacob Loano; Pico di Mirandola and the Jews Elijah del Medigo and Johanan Aleman; Guido Rangoni and the Jew Jacob Mantino; Cardinal Sirleto and the Jew Lazarus de Viterbo; Cardinal Egibio and the Jew Elias Levita. But most romantic of all is the literary friendship of Dante and the Jewish poet Immanuel of Rome. That such friendships existed is a tribute to the manhood of both parties. To override dominant prejudices is hard enough at all times; hardest under circumstances such as prevailed in the social life of the Middle Ages.

Jewish physicians were ever ready to serve without

distinction as to creed or cult and were ever found worthy of the confidence bestowed upon them by their Christian patrons. Even when papal bulls forbade the employment of Jewish physicians, the Popes themselves were waited upon by the skilled men of medical knowledge who were found in the Jewish communities. Had there been any resentment towards the Christian world for its harsh treatment of the Jews, had there been any thought of revenge in their hearts, the Jewish physician and courtier enjoyed unique opportunities for gratifying such a desire. If the Jew had hated his fellow Christians—and we believe he had sufficient provocation for so doing at times—they would not have borne arms and carried burdens for their stepmother-lands.

A Jewish regiment offering its services to the United States need provoke no comment; but Jewish companies in the army of their most Christian majesties Alphonso VI, Alphonso VIII, Alphonso X of Spain, or of Philip the Handsome of France indicate that their relations with their fellows were established on a broad and friendly basis and that they entertained no hostile sentiments, but rather coveted the opportunity to serve when opportunity offered itself to confute their detractors and to prove their worth.

The charge of Jewish antipathy to the non-Jew is most frequently based upon his refusal to inter-

marry. Because of this he has been abused by dissenters from his own midst and by the great outside. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of this intricate and delicate question. This refusal to intermarry is not because the Jew is in any manner hostile to the non-Jew. Those who advocate this do so upon the ground of the integrity of Judaism. The public safety is the supreme law, and the safety of the Jewish group and its viewpoint depends upon its ability to impose such a rule of conduct upon its followers. From the earliest times, Jewish teaching was directed to this end so that the ideal of the Jew might not be lost. Refusal to intermarry with the Canaanitish nations, the stern disapproval of Ezra and Nehemiah of such unions, the practice and the custom through succeeding ages have given this attitude an importance of the first degree. Marriage with a non-Jew is not considered invalid from any point of view. It is considered inexpedient from the point of view of the integrity of the Jewish group. Intermarriage is not deprecated today on the grounds of the superior worth of the Jew to the non-Jew. It is not considered desirable from the point of view of the religious unity and harmony which should prevail in the ideal home. We need not point out that we stand on common ground with all the great religions of the world who hold exactly the same views with regard to intermarriage.

We believe that it is a fundamental right of every group to protect itself in this manner and to perpetuate its particular lines of thought and activity. We hold suicide to be cowardly even if it be in this indirect manner for it offers no solution to our problem or to any problem for all that. Evasion is not solution.

We are ready to admit such into our group who like Ruth of old are ready to declare "Thy people shall be my people, thy God, my God." We stand ready to welcome the convert into our brotherhood, though we are frankly suspicious of those who do not seek us of their own volition and with the purest of motives and intentions. We find expressions of opinion of ancient rabbis condemning such proselytes as a menace to the Jew. Proselytism is a two-edged sword. It may strengthen; it may dilute. The saturation point is a serious matter, for "newcomers" into the faith bring with them considerable of the atmosphere whence they came. Once within the group, there is no discrimination for of old has it been made clear by prophet and by rabbi that "even from them shall I take for priests and for Levites." Any discrimination against the newcomer is strictly forbidden for all are one before God.

The question of the loyalty of the Jew to his adopted country must necessarily come under the purview of our subject. On the one hand his longing

for Zion would seem to have made it impossible for him to identify himself with the new land. Inasmuch as the period of the strongest expression of his love for Zion is usually coincident with the periods of his harshest treatment by his fellows—indeed its intensity is usually to be measured by such persecutions—it is not to be wondered at that he prayed for an escape from his misery. Yet even in such an extreme case as Spain, the love of the Jew for Spain was most pathetic. Further it must be remembered that love of country is more or less tied up with one's rights to own real property. It is only such ownership that is much of a guarantee of permanence and of that increasing loyalty which arises therefrom. And the Jew only in the rarest cases was allowed to own property. He felt the insecurity of his position under such circumstances; yet take it all in all, he developed a marvelous love for his stepmother-lands. The love of the Russian Jew for Russia is almost beyond comprehension. On the other hand, there were never entirely absent certain universalist tendencies in Jewish thought and life. These spiritualized the Messianic hope and looked forward to a world era which would realize the ideals of a spiritual Zionism. And so from Jeremiah down, the thought is repeated in variant form, "Pray for the welfare of the land whither thou goest"; and the dictum of the rabbis that "The law of the land is supreme" was accepted.



So the Zionist today insists that his love for Zion in no manner interferes with his patriotism; and truly of this double love the Zionist must be the one to testify from his own experience. Certainly the record of the modern Jew as a patriot and citizen leaves no opportunity for doubt as to his fervid love for the land of his birth and his citizenship.

When the ghetto doors flew open the Jew did not need to learn tolerance; he had practiced it through all his history. The new life gave him an opportunity for realizing its possibilities and its promises. Our attitude towards the outside world is best demonstrated in the modern world by our works, rather than by our words. Volumes might be written of the contributions of the Jew to the world during the past century. The broad point of view of the modern Jew since his political and social emancipation during the last century can be demonstrated from many a source, sermon, public address, written and spoken word. But of far more significance is the work which the Jew has been doing, and still is doing, in the few decades which have elapsed since his entrance into the larger life of the western world.

His economic success has been his own. Indirectly, he may have thus contributed to the expansion of his nation; but after all is said and done it is for himself and his own gain that he has done these great things. This indirect service has not been mean; its



value, great. However, even in the industrial world, had there been malice in his heart towards his fellow-men, the freedom of association which such life necessitates would have been impossible. It can not be without its meaning that the Jew has played a leading role in the great modern industrial movements which have an ethical basis. Socialism was originated by Jews; and today Jews play a leading role in its spread and interpretation. And under the leadership of a Jew trades unionism has been brought to its highest point of efficiency and been given an increasing ethical bearing. The Jew has thrown himself into the vortex of modern life with a most commendable zeal, and has contributed in most generous manner his very best to the realization of the ideals of the nation of which he has become a citizen.

Along one line he has delighted to work above all others. He has given millions back to the common social fund of the human race for relief and preventive work and has asked that it be distributed to all, regardless of creed, race or color. Recently it was reported that the great bulk of the large sums which had been contributed in modern France for educational purposes had come from Jewish pocketbooks. The Jew gives of himself generously and asks only that common justice be granted him to live his life. Anti-Semitism has thrown many Jews back centuries and made them crawl into their shells; others, the

braver it has determined that their service shall be more generous than ever before. With a moiety of Jewish money feeding the hungry, educating the ignorant, healing the sick and bringing light into dark places, with a splendid devotion of Jewish brains to the problems of all humanity, social, scientific, literary and economic—efforts of the Jew for the world more than for himself, the attitude of the Jew to the world must speak more and more for itself. Non-sectarian work done with the aid of Jewish money and Jewish brains is the best reply which we can make to Anti-Semitism and its mad advocates. Anti-Semitism certainly hurts the Jew, both directly and indirectly; but it is even more harmful to the Anti-Semite. In all Jewish literature no parallels can be found to the foul and vicious utterances of the modern anti-Semite who time and again has advised his Hotspurs to crush every Jewish skull upon which he can lay hold.

The work of such men as Gabriel Riesser, Edward Lasker, Berthold Auerbach, Heinrich Heine, and Ludwig Boerne in the intellectual and political rehabilitation of modern Germany is worthy of mention in this connection. The spectacle of the Jew who had for centuries been denied all rights, social, civil, political, intellectual and economic, throwing himself into the turmoil which surrounded the birth of the new nation—suffering, sacrificing, warring, dying

for the cause—is far more creditable to his generous patriotism than is the denial of his Germanic rights by those whose very names declare them to be of Slavic origin. And what happened in Germany happened, too, in Italy, France, England and America. Those who know Jewish history and Jewish character know full well that when the dark clouds which now cover Russia and Russian Jewry in particular, give way to the light, the muchly abused Russian Jew will evidence his noble instincts by rendering to Russia such service as his fellows have given their new born fatherlands in western Europe and America.

The Jewish scriptures begin with the story of MAN, not with the history of the Jew. His God is the sovereign of the universe, his faith for the day on which God will be one and His name one. The people which started out with a philosophy of history which included all men can have no higher concern than of bringing the dream of brotherhood into realization. Not that the Jew expects Judaism qua Judaism to become the faith of the world although he feels fully convinced that its universal ideas and ideals are expressions of mankind's highest aspirations; yet he does look forward hopefully to that day of mutual sympathy and better understanding between churches, creeds, classes and races, whereon each shall be firm in his own viewpoint, yet all "shall go and say, Come ye, let us go up to the mountain

of the Lord and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His laws, for out of Zion shall go forth the Law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." The Jew of the twentieth century clasps hands with the unknown scribe of Genesis, who wrote "this is the book of the generations of Man" (V. 1). The Jew of America finds himself in accord with the Palestinian rabbi of the second century who offered this verse as the most significant in the Bible because it taught us the common origin of all mankind. We pray today for the world as our fathers offered sacrifices for the nations. The half-forgotten Hellenistic literature of Alexandrian Judaism and the largely unknown literature of the Palestinian and Babylonian rabbis are links in a written tradition which extends right down into our own day. Abraham, the father of the faithful Moses, the man of God, Isaiah and Jeremiah, Ben Sirach, the Palestinian, Philo, the Egyptian, Hillel, the Liberal and Akiba, the Rigorist, Judah the Holy as well as Maimonides, Jehudah Halevy and ibn Gebirol, Mendelssohn and Moses Montefiore, not to omit an Einhorn, a Geiger, a Wise, and scores of other big-souled, large-hearted Jews, who saw beyond the limits of their own group but who realized that that group was worth while, too—all tell the same story of how the Jew regarded the world from his lofty viewpoint of the missionary of the peoples.

The modern Jew still loves his Judaism though he may at times interpret it in manner new to himself and to the world. He believes in it and in himself not only because he has had a wonderful past but also because he knows that he has a still more wonderful future. He would frame a satisfactory restatement of the thought that God chose the fathers to do a great work in the working out of the divine plan, a great work in which Israel would serve the world; he would convey the conviction of his divine sonship to his brethren, whose welfare and security he has ever been seeking.

We Jews recognize our brethren of the world. We ask but the privilege to live our own lives of service and of sacrifice. We are not against the world. We are of it and with it. We are not anti-alien in our hopes or our fears. Our noblest dream of self-realization includes no less than human kind. Many a religious attitude is assumed for no better reason than that a rival faith holds the otherwise. So we feel sure that the misunderstanding of the Jewish idea of election has often caused the resentment of the Gentile; and the harsh treatment of the Jew by the Christian has evoked many a bitter thought in the mind of the Jew; for take it all in all, the world has not judged fairly of the Jewish point of view. Traditional prejudices have condemned him unheard, and the air is still rife with old catch-words, that the Jew



*In Print for Free Distribution*

## JEWISH TRACTS

- No. 1.....What Do Jews Believe?  
RABBI H. G. ENELOW, D.D.
- No. 2.....The Jew in America  
RABBI DAVID PHILIPSON, D.D.
- No. 3.....Jew and Non-Jew  
RABBI MARTIN A. MEYER, Ph.D.
- No. 4.....Jewish Ethics  
RABBI SAMUEL SCHULMAN, D.D.
- No. 5.....The Universal Lord  
RABBI MAURICE H. HARRIS, D.D.
- No. 6.....Humanitarianism of the Laws of Israel  
RABBI JACOB RAISIN, Ph.D.
- No. 7.....Post-Biblical Judaism  
I. Its Biblical Foundation—The Midrash  
RABBI ISRAEL BETTAN, D.D.
- No. 8.....Judaism's Influence in  
the Founding of the Republic  
RABBI MORRIS M. FEUERLICHT, A.B.
- No. 9.....Philanthropy in Rabbinical Literature  
RABBI ABRAHAM CRONBACH, D.D.
- No. 10.....The Jewish Prayerbook  
RABBI SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D.D.
- No. 11.....Judaism and Democracy  
RABBI LOUIS WITT, A. B.
- No. 12.....Jewish Philanthropic  
Institutions in the Middle Ages  
RABBI ABRAHAM CRONBACH, D.D.